July - Dec 1918 t

JAN 28 1918 LIBRARY

The Woman's Protest

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

80 LAFAYETTE STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. 1621 K STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Vol. 11
No. 7

JANUARY
1918

MRS. STEPHEN B. ELKINS
Vice-President National Assn. Opposed to Woman Suffrage

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 19[illegible], at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., Under the Act of March 3, 1879

JK1880
W6

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., Washington, D. C.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Heron, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Miss Anne Maclivaine, Trenton, N. J.; Mrs. F. W. Goddard, Colorado Springs, Colo.; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins, West Virginia; Mrs. George B. Puller, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Grace B. Evans, Selma, Ala.
Secretary, Mrs. Robert Lansing, Washington, D. C.
Treasurer, Miss Anne Squire, Washington, D. C.
General Secretary, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mrs. Stephen S. Fitz Gerald, Boston, Mass.
Miss Mary Kilbreth, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. C. H. Davis, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, O.
Mrs. E. Yarde Breese, Plainfield, N. J.
Mrs. Francis D. Williams, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. H. F. Lyster, Detroit, Mich.
Mrs. David Conant, Bradford, Vt.
Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon, Ga.
Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis, Minn.
Mrs. Oscar Leser, Baltimore, Md.
Miss N. V. Baker, Selma, Ala.
Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas, S. Dak.
Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville, Texas.
Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston, W. Va.
Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington, Iowa.
Mrs. Henry B. Thompson, Greenville, Del.
Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha, Neb.
Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton, Ohio.
Mrs. N. C. Young, Fargo, N. D.
Mrs. C. E. Estabrook, Milwaukee, Wis.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

ALABAMA

President, Miss N. V. Baker, Selma.
First Vice-President, Lida B. Robertson, Mobile.
Secretary and Treasurer, Mrs. Will Roberts, Selma.

CONNECTICUT

President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Lynde Harrison, New Haven.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles H. Lawrence.
Secretary, Miss Carolyn Taylor.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William T. Howe.
Press Chairman, Mrs. William B. Williams.

DELAWARE

President, Mrs. Henry B. Thompson.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Murray Stewart.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Emily P. Bissell, Wilmington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Eugene Dupon, Jr.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Room 320, Oxford Building, 726 14th Street, Washington.

First Vice-President, Mrs. Charles H. Davis.
Treasurer, Miss Ayls Card.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. E. Rollins Morse.
Recording Secretary, Miss Anne Squire.
Chairman, Executive Committee, Mrs. Arthur Wallace Dunn.

GEORGIA

President, Miss Caroline Patterson, Macon.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Walter D. Lamar.
Secretary, Mrs. B. F. Sutton.
State Organizer, Mrs. S. C. Moore.
Treasurer, Mrs. Flewellen Holt.
Chairman Membership Committee, Mrs. R. J. Taylor.
Honorary Vice-President, Miss Mildred Rutherford.
Chairman Finance Committee, Mrs. Charles Hilbun, Macon.

IOWA

Office: 1032 North Fourth Street, Burlington.

President, Mrs. F. A. Millard, Burlington.
First Vice-President, Miss Alice French, Davenport.
Secretary, Miss Mary Chittenden, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. F. I. Herriott, Des Moines.

MAINE

Honorary President, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland.
President, Mrs. Clarence Hale, Portland.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Oscar R. Wish, Mrs. Isaac Watson Dyer, Mrs. George E. Bird.
Treasurer, Mrs. Bertrand T. Wheeler, Portland.
Secretary, Mrs. Fred E. Hollis, 1181 Congress Street, Portland.
Assistant Secretary, Mrs. W. H. Bradford, Portland.
Registrar, Mrs. Clayton Whipple, Portland.
Auditor, Mrs. Edville G. Abbott, Portland.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Oscar Leser.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Treasurer, Mrs. J. Frank Crouch.
Legislative Committee Chairman, Mrs. John Haslup Adams.
Secretary, Mrs. P. Lea Thom.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Claude H. Hall.

MASSACHUSETTS

687 Boylston Street, Boston.

President, Mrs. Stephen S. Fitz Gerald.
Chairman Executive Committee, Mrs. Louis A. Frothingham.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline, Mass.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Randolph Frothingham.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, Detroit.
First Vice-President, Mrs. L. E. Clark.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Recording Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit.

MINNESOTA

Honorary President, Mrs. Johnson W. Straight, St. Paul.
President, Mrs. J. B. Gilfillan, Minneapolis.
First Vice-President, Mrs. William Davis.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. W. W. Sykes, Minneapolis.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Stevens, St. Paul.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Ruth M. Currie, 302 Meyers Arcade, Minneapolis.

NEBRASKA

President, Mrs. Edward Porter Peck, Omaha.
Secretary, Mrs. Wm. Archibald Smith, 102 South 35th Street.
Treasurer, Mrs. C. C. George, 5218 Chicago Street.
Executive Committee, Mrs. L. P. Crofoot, Chairman.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
First Vice-President, Mrs. O. D. Felton, Concord.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, 8 South State Street, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carrie R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

Office: 32 West State Street, Trenton.

Honorary President, Miss Anna L. Dayton.
President, Mrs. E. Yarde Breese.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Thomas J. Preston, Jr.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. G. Herbert Smith, Summit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Ellsworth A. Corbett, Trenton.
General Secretary, Mrs. O. D. Oliphant, Trenton.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles R. Smith, Ellison Street, Paterson.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 280 Madison Ave., New York.

President, Miss Mary Kilbreth.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. Eleanor G. Hewitt.
Secretary, Miss Elizabeth F. Gallaudet.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. Church.

NORTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. N. C. Young.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. J. G. Gunderson, Mrs. H. R. Hopkins, Mrs. E. B. Goss.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Ralph Beard.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. E. L. Wiswell.
Treasurer, Mrs. H. F. Chaffee.

OHIO

Office: 1744 E. McMillan Street, Cincinnati.

President, Mrs. Harry E. Talbott, Dayton.
First Vice-President, Mrs. W. Austin Goodman.
Secretary, Mrs. Florence Goff Schwarr, Cincinnati.
Treasurer, Mrs. John A. MacMillan, 9 Dartmouth Drive, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 1324 Widener Building, Philadelphia.

President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
First Vice-President, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles W. Henry.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary and Assistant Treasurer, Miss Laura M. Sloan.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale.
First Vice-President, Miss Louise C. Hoppin.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness, Providence.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard.
Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

SOUTH DAKOTA

President, Mrs. Ernest Jackson, Dallas.
First Vice-President, Mrs. George B. Mansfield, Rapid City.
Secretary, Mrs. Elias Jacobsen, Pierre.
Treasurer, Mrs. S. S. Ruble.
Chairman Literature Committee, Mrs. E. B. Northrup.

TEXAS

President, Mrs. James B. Wells, Brownsville.
Vice-President, Mrs. George F. Arnold, 709 McKinney Avenue, Houston.

VERMONT

President, Mrs. David Conant, Bradford.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Edward Kirkland.
Secretary, Miss S. Blanche Stranahan, Bradford.
Treasurer, Miss Hattie Brock, South Newbury.

VIRGINIA

Post-office Box 368, Richmond.

Honorary President, Miss Jane Rutherford.
President, Mrs. Francis D. Williams.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Otho G. Kean.
Treasurer, Mrs. Lewis Strauss.
Recording Secretary, Miss Maury Robinson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Chiles M. Ferrell.

WEST VIRGINIA

1102 Kanawha Street, Charleston.

Honorary Presidents, Mrs. A. B. Fleming, Fairmont; Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins.
President, Mrs. D. C. Gallaher, Charleston.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Howard Simpson, Wheeling.
Treasurer, Miss Jean Brown, Charleston.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Mayo Tollman, Charleston.
Enrollment Secretary, Mrs. Joseph Gaines, Charleston.

WISCONSIN

President, Mrs. C. E. Estabrook.
First Vice-President, Mrs. F. W. Hoyt.
Second Vice-President, Mrs. J. G. Flanders.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Holliday.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss E. O. Couro.
Treasurer, Mrs. L. S. Litchfield.

1908 16 F 27

THE HONOR ROLL OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON Thursday, January 10th, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 274 to 136, surrendered to the suffrage threats and demands, and passed the Susan B. Anthony amendment which every other Congress since 1869 has refused to pass. At the last moment—the night before the vote was taken—President Wilson let it be known that he favored the amendment, and issued the following statement to a committee of Congressmen who had been directed to visit the White House:

"The Committee found that the President had not felt at liberty to volunteer his advice to Members of Congress in this important matter, but when we sought his advice, he very frankly and earnestly advised us to vote for the amendment as an act of right and justice to the women of the country and of the world."

It was declared on the floor of the House that the President wrote this statement with his own hand. It was also asserted by Representative Raker, of the Woman Suffrage Committee, that he had known for three weeks that the President was in favor of the amendment, but knew how to keep it quiet.

The Federal amendment could have been defeated by *two votes*, and many of the men who voted for it are lamenting the fact now, especially one New York Congressman who had a speech prepared against it the night before, but who had not enough courage to stand by his convictions when the vote was taken, but voted "aye." Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, issued the following statement:

"We thank the men who stood by the principle of local self-government against the policy of surrender to suffrage threats and we are proud that there are still some American men who vote according to their convictions and not according to command. We consider the result very close in view of the pressure brought to bear on the members.

"Our hope now is that the Senate will stand firm in defense of our American traditions of true democracy."

The Honor Roll of Members who voted for the preservation of "the right of each State to settle this question for itself" *by popular vote;* the men who stood by their party platforms and their oath "To Uphold and Defend the Constitution of the United States Against All Foreign and Domestic Enemies," follows:

DEMOCRATS

ALMON	DOUGHTON	KEHOE
ASHBROOK	DUPRE	KEY
ASKELL	EAGLE	KINCHELOE
BANKHEAD	ESTOPINAL	KITCHIN
BELL	FLOOD	LARSON
BLACK	GARD	LAZARO (Ga.)
BLACKMON	GARNER (Texas)	LESHER
BRAND	GARRETT (Tenn.)	LEVER
BUCHANAN	GLASS	LENORGAN
BURNETT	GODWIN (N. C.)	McLEMORE
BYRNES (S. C.)	GORDON	MANSFIELD
CANDLER	GRAY (Ala.)	MONTAGUE
CARLIN	HARDY	MOON
CLARK (Fla.)	HARRISON (Miss.)	NICHOLIS
CLAYPOOL	HARRISON (Va.)	OLIVER (Ala.)
COADY	HEFLIN	OLNEY
COLLIER	HELM	OVERMYER
CRISP	HOUSTON	OVERTSTREET
DENT	HOWARD	PARK
DEWALT	HUDDLESTON	POLK
DIES	HULL (Tenn.)	POU
DOMINICK	HUMPHREYS	PRICE
DOREMUS	JONES (Va.)	QUIN

DEMOCRATS—Continued

RAGSDALE	SNOOK	WATKINS
RAYBURN	STEAGALL	WATSON (Va.)
RIORDAN	STEDMAN	WEBB
ROBINSON	STEELE	WELTY
ROUSE (Ky.)	STEPHENS (Miss.)	WHALEY
SANDERS (La.)	STEVENSON	WHITE (Ohio)
SAUNDERS (Va.)	TAGUE	WILSON (La.)
SHERLEY	TOLBOTT	WILSON (Texas)
SISSON	VENABLE	WISE
SLAYDEN	VINSON	YOUNG (Texas)
SMALL	WALKER	

TOTAL DEMOCRATS—102.

REPUBLICANS

BROWNING	HULL (Iowa)	MUDD
CRAGO	KEARNS	PAIGE
DALLINGER	KREIDER	PARKER (N. J.)
FOCHT	LONGWORTH	STAFFORD
GARLAND	LUFKIN	SWITZER
GILLETT	RAMSEY	TILSON
GOULD	SANDERS (N. Y.)	TINKHAM
GRAY (N. J.)	McLAUGHLIN (Penn.)	VOIGHT (Wis.)
GREENE (Mass.)	MEEKER	WALSH
GREENE (Vt.)	MOORE (Penn.)	WATSON (Penn.)
HEATON	MORIN	WINSLOW (Mass.)

TOTAL REPUBLICANS—33.

MISCELLANEOUS

MARTIN (La.), Progressive. Total—1.

TOTAL AGAINST—136.

Paired—REED and GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD (for), and DUNN (against); IRELAND and LA GUARDIA (for), and PADGETT (against); CURRY of California and MILLER of Washington (for), and HOLLAND (against); JOHNSON of South Dakota (for), and COOPER of West Virginia (against).

Absent or Not Voting—CAPSTICK, CARY, DRUKKER, GRAHAM of Pennsylvania, HEINTZ and HOOD.

The 600,000 men who voted against woman suffrage in New York State—and the women they represent—should remember that character and convictions are the most dependable qualities in a public servant; that *Representatives Gould, Riordan and Sanders* of New York voted against the Federal amendment in spite of all the pressure; that, as Ida Husted Harper says, "more than anything, the New York suffrage victory had the effect of putting over the Federal amendment," but that these men refused to help "put over" suffrage on other States simply because the Pro-German Socialists of New York City put it over on their own State.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

THE December copy and proofs for THE WOMAN'S PROTEST were lost in the mails "somewhere" between New York and Washington for several weeks. It has therefore been necessary to omit the December number. Subscriptions will be extended one month to make up for the omission of the December issue. The February number of THE WOMAN'S PROTEST will be the last—and the best—issue published. It will contain not only an index of the PROTEST for the last five years, but a summary of information against woman suffrage such as has never been printed before, with a feature section on *Socialism*. In March, THE WOMAN'S PROTEST, *The Remonstrance* and *Anti-Suffrage Notes* will all be combined into a new national newspaper, THE WOMAN PATRIOT. (See advertisement on back page.) Write us what kind of a newspaper YOU think the WOMAN PATRIOT should be. We will tell you OUR plans in the February PROTEST.
—*Editor*, WOMAN'S PROTEST.

The Woman's Protest
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

Published Monthly at
80 Lafayette Street, New York, N. Y., by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
1621 K Street, Washington, D. C.

President, Mrs. Jas. Wadsworth, Jr..Washington, D. C.
Secretary, Mrs. Robert Lansing.....Washington, D. C.
Treasurer, Miss Anne Squire.....Washington, D. C.

Vol. XI January, 1918 No. 7

206

There are even greater words than Liberty, Equality and Rights. Lacordaire, during the revolution in France, dared to say to his countrymen: "You have written upon the monuments of your city the words Liberty, Fraternity, Equality. Above Liberty write Duty, above Fraternity write Humility, above Equality write Service, above the immemorial creed of your Rights inscribe the divine creed of your Duties."

A CAMPAIGN OF CAMOUFLAGE

THE suffragists, including a woman member of Congress, have been conducting an organized campaign to conceal from other members of Congress the obnoxious features of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment, especially the fact that it actually destroys the right of the people to decide the question of woman suffrage by popular vote.

We have received a letter signed by a woman member of Congress, addressed to another member, in which she says:

"Of course, voting for the Susan B. Anthony Amendment is not voting to enfranchise the women. It simply delegates power to the various State Legislatures to extend the right of suffrage to the women."

This is submarine politics, camouflage—the sort of thing used by Lenine and Trotzky to fool the Russians into separate peace. The letter quoted was sent to a Southern member known to be opposed to the amendment. It is believed that it was sent to other such members—to lead them into voting to take away the control of the suffrage from the people of their own States without realizing it.

ROBS PEOPLE OF POWER OVER LOCAL ELECTIONS

THE Federal Amendment gives the Legislature of Idaho the right to say who shall vote for mayor in Cincinnati—after the people of Ohio have defeated woman suffrage three times at the polls! It gives the Legislature of Wyoming the right to say who shall vote for aldermen in Boston, although the people of Massachusetts have denied such power to their own State Legislature, and reserved it to themselves. It gives the Legislature of Utah the right to say who shall vote in New Orleans without regard to the will of the people of Louisiana. It gives the Legislature of Maine the right to say that Chinese shall vote in San Francisco, without consulting the wishes of the people of California.

No more vicious measure has ever been proposed in Congress.

DESTRUCTION OF LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

DEMOCRATS and Republicans, patriotic suffragists like Senator Borah of Idaho, and all anti-suffragists agree that this amendment means the destruction of local self-government. Yet there are men in Congress who do not even realize that it is *not* referred to the *people* of the various States—and politically ambitious women are doing all in their power to keep members of Congress in ignorance of what this bill really does.

THE "INEVITABLE"

To the Editor of the WOMAN'S PROTEST:

"WOMAN suffrage is inevitable," declares Mrs. C. C. Catt, in opening her recent printed address to Congress. She thereupon uses up six pages of her address to make Congress *believe* that "woman suffrage is inevitable"—which she states ten times—the implication being that Congress simply must yield to repetition of the "eventually, why not now?" argument.

Men who *originated* this argument, however, have never gone to Congress and asked for a Constitutional Amendment to *compel the people* to use the articles thus advertised. They have been satisfied to let *the people themselves* judge the merit of these goods, in comparison and competition with *other* goods some of the people might prefer.

But this is exactly what Mrs. Catt and her cohorts refuse to do. The "inevitable" must not be left to the people—or it might be prevented, or at least postponed!

"All careful investigators must arrive at the same conclusion," says Mrs. Catt (page 10)—"that the only hope for the enfranchisement of the women of the several States is through Congressional action."

The "inevitable" might be *repealed* by the people, even after its adoption in forty-eight States, Mrs. Catt also fears.

"If the entire forty-eight States should severally enfranchise women," she says (page 9), "their political status would still be inferior to that of men, since no provision for national protection in their right to vote would exist. The women of California or New York are not wholly enfranchised, for the national government has not denied the States the right to deprive them of the vote." [And revoke the "inevitable!"]

Nor has it dawned upon the mind of this stateswoman, whose "first message to Congress" is mostly concerned with the use of this term, that the "inevitable" is usually the thing "human beings" most often desire *to escape or avoid.*

Imagine *Death* sending a message to Congress demanding the repeal of laws that protect and prolong Life; imagine a corporaton refusing to pay insurance or compensation because death is "inevitable"; imagine *Taxes* ordering Congress to double the local levies in all of the States, because higher local taxes in some of the suffrage States are "inevitable"—and we have a fair mental picture of the logical value of this latest suffrage argument.

And this is the proof, *perhaps,* as Dr. Anna Howard Shaw was quoted some time ago by the New York *Tribune,* that:

"There are three women in the United States today who might occupy the Presidential chair with greater success than any of the Republicans, Democrats or Whigs that have so far appeared. They are Jane Addams, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt and Mrs. Joseph Bowen, of Chicago. Susan B. Anthony would have made a better executive than Abraham Lincoln."

Congress may not be able to *prevent* the ultimate advent of the "inevitable" Woman President, Woman Politician and Woman Boss predicted by the feminists for that futurist "female century" when women will be "the ruling sex" and "mother-rule"—by childless women—will supplant all "man-made laws."

But Congress can at least postpone this "inevitable" calamity—and thus win the gratitude of the majority of the American men and women of the *present* generation, *who want to win this war now,* and to put off the feminist fight until they have more time to devote to academic debate and the "inevitable."

A MERE MAN

OUR SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

"THE keynote of our campaign now is the determination to protect America from the enemies within her borders," declared Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., in closing her first annual address as president of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, which held its second convention at the headquarters in Washington, December 12th.

"We have invented no new methods," said Mrs. Wadsworth, "but we can now go to the country with a stronger appeal than ever before. New York has furnished us with new ammunition. The socialist-pacifist menace behind the woman suffrage movement is no longer a mere anti-suffrage argument. It is a mathematically demonstrated fact. Woman suffrage has been voted upon nineteen times in the last five years. Sixteen times it was defeated by popular vote. Does that look like it is bound to come? The three times it carried, in Montana, Nevada and New York, it was directly due to the increased socialist vote."

The rounds of applause which followed Mrs. Wadsworth's address were repeated when Miss Minnie Bronson, general secretary of the association, in making her report, said:

"We have done something this year that the suffragists have been telling us all along that we never could do. We have repealed woman suffrage in Ohio, in spite of their utmost attempts to put it over on the people through the Legislature, without a referendum. And we have had suffrage in Indiana declared unconstitutional, and this decision applies to several other States. Moreover, we have had calls from Colorado, Idaho, Washington and California to come and work for the repeal of woman suffrage there. We are going to continue to work for its repeal, whether it is in Colorado or New York next, until we remove this menace of suffrage and socialism from the United States."

Miss Mary Kilbreth, the newly elected president of the New York State Association, assertetd that the anti-suffragists of New York would reorganize with a larger and stronger organization than ever. The Albany Association, which sent no delegates, telegraphed Mrs. Wadsworth that it had resolved to continue its work. Elmira and Binghamton were represented and also decided to continue the campaign.

Miss Bronson alluded to the $87,000 recently raised by the suffragists and said:

"We do not need $87,000. We would not know what to do with it. Anyhow, $1,000 goes as far with an anti as $10,000 with a suffragist. But we do need $8,700 for our present campaign here in Washington."

Mrs. Horace Brock, president of the Pennsylvania Association then said:

"This country today is suffering from an attack of moral pacifism. As a nation we have been asking and hoping for peace at any price, and now we are paying the price. Preparedness might have prevented the war, if it could have been prevented. And an adequate campaign fund would have prevented woman suffrage. But when you go to the people who ought to be in this fight with us, the people whose homes and families and children and property we are trying to protect, they say 'It is a pity but suffrage seems to be coming.' If Albert of Belgium had said that, the Kaiser would be in Paris today. And if anti-suffragists say it, the socialists and revolutionists will be in power in America tomorrow.

"Let us begin by maintaining an efficient office in Washington. I estimate that it will cost $1,000 a month, and I will be one of twelve women to pledge $1,000 a year to keep it up."

Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Mrs. H. B. Thompson of Delaware, and Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Mrs. Charles W. Henry and Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose made similar pledges. Miss Bronson's request for $8,700 was met by pledges which amounted to something over $9,000. A permanent committee to raise funds, with Miss Minnie Bronson at its head, was resolved upon.

The Constitution was amended to make all presidents of State Associations ineligible as vice-presidents, and four other women were elected to fill their places: Mrs. F. W. Goddard, of Colorado Springs, Colorado, Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins, of West Virginia; Mrs. George Puller of Washington, D. C., and Mrs. J. B. Evans of Selma, Alabama.

This is the first convention held since the election of Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., as president. Under Mrs. Wadsworth's leadership, the association has developed a much stronger organization, elected Mrs. Robert Lansing its secretary, and has adopted a new platform proclaiming itself against socialism as well as suffrage.

It has also obtained the active support of some of the country's leading men, who now serve on its Advisory Committee, which is composed of the following men:

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Senator John W. Weeks, Senator James W. Wadsworth, Jr., Hon. Charles S. Fairchild, former Secretary of Treasury of the United States; Hon. George W. Wickersham, former Attorney General; Justice George Gray of Delaware; Justice Oscar Leser, of Maryland; Rev. M. W. Jacobus, D. D., of the Harvard Theological School; Colonel Archibald Hopkins, of Washington; Dr. Charles B. Penrose, John Cadwalader, Jr., and S. F. Houston, of Philadelphia; Ezra Prentice, of New York and Robert A. Garrett, of Baltimore.

Among the members of the association who registered at headquarters during the convention were the following:

From New York: Miss Mary G. Kilbreath, Mrs. A. M. Banker (Johnstown), Mrs. W. W. Gregg, Elmira; Mrs. M. H. Murphy, Miss F. M. Gannett. From Philadelphia: Mrs. Horace Brock, Mrs. Charles W. Henry, Mrs. J. Gardner Cassatt, Mrs. Frederick Landstreet, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose. From Baltimore: Mrs. Oscar Leser, Mrs. M. C. Talbot, Mrs. Paul Waters, Mrs. G. B. Fectig, Mrs. Frances T. Redwood, Mrs. Herbert Tiffany, Mrs. M. B. Wild, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose, Mrs. James W. Boyle, Mrs. J. Frank Crouch, Mrs. Rosalie Strauss, Mrs. Elizabeth Pleitner. From Massachusetts: Mrs. H. P. White, Boston; Mrs. N. A. Middleton, Mrs. Thomas Allen, Mrs. John G. Faxon. From Connecticut: Mrs. D. A. Markham. From Delaware: Miss Emily P. Bissell, Mrs. Willard Saulsbury, Mrs. H. P. Thompson. From New Jersey: Miss Clara Vezin, Miss Anne McIlvaine. From Iowa: Mrs. D. B. Henderson, Miss Belle S. Henderson. Minnesota: Mrs. E. C. Stringer. West Virginia: Mrs. Stephen B. Elkins. Virginia: Miss Maury Robinson.

A LETTER TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Gentlemen:

Your attention is invited to the following facts:

1. The proposed Federal suffrage amendment positively destroys the right of the people to vote on the question of woman suffrage, as provided for in their State Constitutions, and allows woman suffrage to be forced on unwilling States by the Legislatures of *other* States.

2. This proposal is a violation of the present Constitution of the United States, which provides that

> "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or *to the people.*"

3. The people, through their State Constitutions, ratified by popular vote, have reserved the right to adopt or withhold woman suffrage *by popular vote.*

4. This proposal asks you to rob the people of this right; to repudiate your party platform which recognizes the right of each State to settle this question for itself *by popular vote.*

Every principle of patriotism, every ideal of self-government, and your oath to defend the Constitution, urges you to vote against the attempt to obtain woman suffrage in spite of the expressed will of the people.

Moreover, this amendment, in time of war, would immediately open up a new nation-wide suffrage campaign in forty-eight States to secure its ratification.

It would give the suffragists and socialists the opportunity to annoy and pester every Legislator in the United States until a majority of the men in thirty-six Legislatures surrendered their judgment and principles to political threats and cajolery.

It would mean that no Legislature in the United States could meet without *being surrounded by suffrage pickets.*

It would be an official endorsement of nagging as *a national policy.*

It would give every radical woman the right to believe that she could get any law she wanted by "pestering" her City Council, her Legislature, her Congressman or her President—no matter how the people voted, nor what national crisis existed. And if feminism can be put through by pestering, regardless of the will of the people, so can pacifism, socialism and other isms.

Woman suffrage has been voted upon nineteen times in the last five years. *Sixteen* times it was *defeated by popular vote.*

Three times (in Montana, Nevada and New York), it carried as the direct result of the increased socialist vote. This fact has been demonstrated mathematically.

Will you not defend the Constitution, your party platform and the rights of the people, rather than surrender to the futile threats and impotent dictation of the woman suffrage machine and the socialists, who are seeking this amendment precisely because they are not strong enough to carry woman suffrage in the majority of States *by popular vote?*

Respectfully yours,
(Signed) ALICE H. WADSWORTH,
President.

THE VITAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE SUFFRAGE AND PROHIBITION AMENDMENTS

"THE passage of the prohibition amendment makes victory for the Susan B. Anthony amendment a certainty," declared the suffragists the day after the prohibition amendment was passed.

"Even Southern members who have professed to stand on a State rights platform have yielded their position on the prohibition amendment," said Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt. "To do this and hold out on the suffrage amendment will be to confess that they use the State right argument only as a convenient pretext."

Mrs. Catt's confusion of the two amendments can be accounted for in two ways—either she is ignorant of the vital differences between the issues involved, or her attempt to associate them is merely one of the usual suffrage devices whereby the "cause" is attached to war work, prohibition or anything else that will give it publicity and political prominence it cannot obtain on its own merits.

Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, is not a "Southern member" nor a Democrat. He is a Republican and a *suffragist,* from a State where women have voted for twenty-one years, yet on this point—the vital difference between the prohibition and suffrage amendments—he has said:

"The national prohibition amendment might be justified on the theory that it would be dealing with a national question—interstate traffic—and that it is not local and can not be controlled as a local question; that the States can not deal with it, as it permeates and extends throughout the Union, disregardful of State lines. And here let me say that the doctrine of local self-government does not oppose the taking over by the National Government of those things once local, but which, through industrial and economic changes, have become national in scope. If a subject really becomes national in scope and effect, the National Government should not hesitate to take hold of it. But the right to vote can never, in the very nature of things, be other than a local question, for upon it rests the very integrity and sovereignty of the State."

Senator Borah might have added that the National Government has already exercised control over the liquor traffic, inspected its manufacture and licensed its sale—whereas the National Government has never claimed control over the qualifications for the exercise of the suffrage.

The suffrage is so local in its very nature that it is affected by a change of residence from county to county, from precinct to precinct within a single State.

Control of the suffrage is so essential to the "inherent, original sovereignty" of the States that the people have reserved to themselves the exclusive right to change these qualifications, and have denied their *own* State Legislature this power, in every State but Delaware.

Again, it may be argued that prohibition is not effective in a State where liquor can be shipped in from a neighboring State. But no State that has adopted woman suffrage is affected in its exercise by the fact that neighboring States have or have not adopted woman suffrage. It secures the full effect of its women's votes upon all State elections and upon its representation in Congress and the Electoral College. No State's representation in Congress or the Electoral College is affected by its adoption or rejection of woman's suffrage, nor by the action of any other State upon the woman suffrage question.

In short, to repeat Senator Borah's statement:

"The right to vote can never, in the very nature of things, be other than a local question," while the right to regulate, license, control or prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor is already exercised by the National Government, which has given the President full power in this matter; a power that Congress can not give even the President with respect to the qualifications for voting in the several States.

And, in the language of Senator Borah regarding *this amendment,* "Popular Government is a Delusion, a Pretense, Without the Principle of Local Self-Government."

"TO BE STRONG IS TO PREVAIL—TO BE WEAK IS TO INVITE DEFEAT"

THE following letter was written by Mr. Henry A. Wise Wood to a member of Congress and we are glad to be able to publish it in this month's issue of the PROTEST.

New York, December 15, 1917.

HON. — —
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:—

Until the outbreak of war, in 1914, I was a believer in woman suffrage. In January, 1915, I entered the Preparedness campaign and during the following two years devoted myself to the work of arousing our people to the need for immediate military preparation.

Throughout this period more than one hundred and fifty audiences passed under my observation, in the territory lying between Maine and Tennessee, Utah and the Atlantic Coast, and a correspondence which embraced all of the States in the Union.

My experience compelled me to abandon my advocacy of woman suffrage. I had seen enough of the behaivor of women under the threat of war to conclude that they are unfitted to deal in advance with any of its questions, to take any action whatever of a preparatory nature, or to act constructively at all until after war has become a settled state and men have put their work into their hands.

Also I found that the suffrage movement was given over to pacifism in its socialistic form, and that its chief officers were to be found among the most active opponents of those who were striving to prepare the country for the very emergency that has since overtaken us.

My conclusions may be summarized as follows:

That until society is stable and nations no longer have need to fear each other can the United States with safety to itself commit the full half of its governing power into the hands of the unmilitary sex;

That to unman our government in this hour of supreme danger, and stake the national security upon the success of an experiment in idealism dictated by considerations of sentiment which are blind to the naked essentials of military power, would be a reckless unmilitary action fraught with the gravest possibilities of disaster;

That in our present undertaking to be strong is to prevail, to be weak is to invite defeat; that the exchange of masculine strength for feminine weakness in our governmental councils would prolong hostilities, would lessen the power of our blows, and would make for an inconclusive peace, leaving a new and more terrible war awaiting us beyond the horizon.

For the foregoing weighty national reasons I am unalterably opposed to woman suffrage. The last few years have taught me that nations are safeguarded not by their gentler qualities but by their ability to crush with brute force whoever unjustly assails them. To create, to direct, to deliver brute force is assuredly a man's, not a woman's job.

First let us finish the war and rid the world of its tyrant nations; not before then will it be safe for us to consider the effeminization of our electorate.

Respectfully,
HENRY WISE WOOD.

HOW RADICALS HOPE TO RUSSIANIZE THIS COUNTRY

IN a letter to members of Congress on December 18th, Charles S. Fairchild, Secretary of the Treasury under Grover Cleveland, and President of the American Constitutional League, declares that "pro-Germans, pacifists and socialists hope to *Russianize* this country, by passing a Federal suffrage amendment and then demanding a referendum to men and women voters on this war."

Mr. Fairchild warns Congress that the radicals hope to "force the laying down of arms" through women's votes in such a referendum, and he says that no matter how conducted, it might lead to rebellion.

"If 30,000,000 men and women voted, 16,000,000 for the war, and 14,000000 against the war—or *vice versa*—nobody would know how the majority of the men had voted," Mr. Fairchild asserts. "Resistance to the selective draft would be encouraged and another Civil War might result before we found out where the majority of the men stand."

Such an election would cost the country about $60,000,000, or the price of five dreadnaughts, in Mr. Fairchild's opinion.

"Every patriotic American must see the peril of doubling the pro-German, pacifist vote at this time," he concludes, "even without the tragic example of Russia showing that weakness in America now would let the Kaiser win this war."

TO CHALLENGE THIRD "BLACKLIST"

The American Constitutional League, of which Mr. Fairchild is president, has already "pledged its hearty support" to members of Congress who vote against the suffrage amendment. It was stated at the Washington office of the League that in the event of another suffrage "blacklist" of Congressmen, the League would take an active part in defending these men and would work for their reelection. It was pointed out that the first suffrage "blacklist" of 1915 was a total failure, not one of the eighteen men on it being defeated. Senators Lodge and Underwood were on the "blacklist" at that time.

It was also stated that the last Presidential campaign, in which President Wilson, in spite of the Woman's Party, carried ten of the eleven full suffrage States against a Federal Amendment candidate, proves that suffragists cannot defeat a man on this issue, even in suffrage States.

Particular significance was attached to the fact that the Utah suffrage delegation, claiming to represent 90 per cent. of the women voters of Utah, where women have voted twenty-one years, publicly confessed its failure to move the junior Senator from that State to favor the amendment. It is said that this shows "that men who know from experience what women can do in politics are not afraid of the threats and blacklists of suffragists."

WASHINGTON NEWS AND NOTES

By Mrs. George F. Richards

THE Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives returned the Anthony amendment to Congress without recommendation. Not one man on that great committee—even though he favored suffrage under state rights—would assume the responsibility of recommending it as a Constitutional Amendment. The vote of the Committee stood 18 to 2 and the two men who did not vote to return without recommendation voted to report against the passage of the bill.

After weathering the storms and vicissitudes of forty-odd years, Aunt Susan's amendment went down before the calm, cool judgment of the Judiciary Committee, which is composed of the best lawyers of Congress, and it is a committee in which the sentiment as to State suffrage is divided. It got such a black eye that it will take more than the famous vinegar and brown paper restorative to which little Jill resorted to bring it back to a normal condition. You remember how, when Jack took his notable tumble down hill while fetching a pail of water, "Jill she came to ease the pain with vinegar and brown paper"? But the Anthony amendment got something worse from the Judiciary committee than a broken crown—it got a blow so serious that it threatens to put it out of commission for some time to come, even though the newly organized suffrage committee is making strenuous efforts to get it back on its feet. Perhaps the committee will be successful. Perhaps the amendment will pass Congress, but at this moment the chances are strongly against it in both Senate and House. The Suffrage Committee has for its chairman Congressman Raker of California, with Miss Rankin of Montana as ranking member on the Republican side. Miss Rankin made a big bid for the chairmanship, but failed to get favorable consideration, and Mr. Raker's selection was unanimous, when the House vote was taken. When the vote of the Judiciary Committee became known the suffragists, led by the militants, changed their tactics and instead of continuing to urge an immediate vote by Congress, have made every effort to block the wheels for action either before Christmas or early January. Had the vote been pressed at the time the Judiciary report was filed, the amendment would have been defeated by a strong vote. It is regrettable that many Congressmen who are against suffrage felt that only war measures should be brought up at the present session, in accordance with the expressed views of the President, and so did not take an immediate vote on suffrage as they otherwise would have done. An attempt was made to consider it before the holiday recess, but one man or another raised objection when unanimous consent was asked, and so the measure was put over till later in the session, if it comes to a vote at all, which is at this moment a matter of some doubt.

Congressman Tilson of the 3rd Connecticuf District hit the nail squarely on the head when he went on record as making the shortest, but one of the most comprehensive speeches of the session. It was while the bill for National Prohibition was before the House for debate, a few minutes before the final vote was taken. Time was precious and hard to obtain. Colonel Tilson asked for one minute in which to speak, and it was granted. Said he:—"Mr. Speaker, it will not require all of the one minute given me to state my position. In my judgment this is not the time, the place or the manner in which to bring about prohibition or woman suffrage. Both should be accomplished if at all by means of the ballot, within the several states and at a time when the country is not in the midst of a great war." Colonel Tilson had thus covered suffrage and prohibition tersely and well, and had occupied but half a minute in so doing. He took his seat in the midst of applause and was complimented on both the soundness of his argument and the notable brevity of his remarks. Congress is plainly getting impatient over the way the suffragists attempt to play to their own advantage, instead of treating the matter from a broad and national view-point. When they think they can win, they heckle the men for an early vote; when their view-point changes and they fear they are playing a losing game, they change their tactics and urge and heckle and threaten the men to delay the vote. The fact is, Congress is getting tired of being either cajoled or threatened by women regarding the suffrage question, who are making themselves so obnoxious to many of the Members that they are playing right into the hands of the women who oppose suffrage and are likely to add votes to the anti-suffrage strength in both Senate and House. At this moment it looks as if suffrage would be defeated in both branches of Congress if brought to a vote this session.

* * *

I had been informed by suffragists that the pickets who were to be taken to the Alexandria Police Court on their own petition for a change from Occoquan jail to the District of Columbia jail, were in such an emaciated and weakened condition that if they appeared in Court they would probably be brought in on stretchers. So I went to Annapolis to judge for myself how accurately the Cameron House view-point coincided with the facts. And as those 23 pickets entered the Court room it seemed to me that the militant suffrage ladies must be day dreamers. The 23 pickets walked into the Court room with firm strides. They all had a healthy color, apparently carried their usual amount of flesh and showed no signs of privation, ill treatment or hunger. They had been brought from Occoquan in comfortable automobiles and had all eaten a hearty breakfast before leaving the jail. The nearest approach to substantiation of the reported hunger strike that I could obtain was that one or two women went without a meal or two some days before. The pickets were determined, grim and smileless, but they were as husky a set of women as I have seen in many a day.

When talking about the experience she had in Occoquan Miss Burns gave out a typewritten statement in which she said: "When I was taken to put on prison clothes I resisted strenuously." But this is the way such resistance is described in the *Washington Post*:

"Them ladies? Why, man, they're bolsheviki!"

An Occoquan guard was talking. He was considerably nicked and rumpled, and he said that he had just gotten a little time off to recuperate.

He was talking about the 31 pickets of the Woman's National Party, who, according to their sisters outside the workhouse, have been beaten, abused and threatened by Occoquan officials.

"We try to use them peaceable," continued the guard mournfully. "But them ladies pack a punch that would drop a ox. I know."

He said that Miss Lucy Burns and eleven other pickets had organized a determined rebellion which they were going to conduct until their rights as special prisoners were recognized or their time was up.

"And that Miss Lucy Burns," went on the guard, as he rubbed a bruised place on his cheek, "she's got six months to go."

His voice dropped several notes.

"If she stays," he went on, "we strike. I gotta a wife to take care of, and them older lady pickets they don't care what they do to us."

"If we get many more of them pickets," said the guard, in a hollow voice, "they'll need the molish down here. We'll all be gone from here—in the army or some place where you got a chance."

"Eleven of them pickets," he went on, "sit around in their cells all day with nothing on but blankets. The women took their clothes and they won't wear the prison clothes because they say they're political prisoners—and there you are.

"Two of them punched Billy," he remarked, "just because he went near 'em. And the worst of it is we got orders that we ain't to do nothing to them. Here we get kicked and scratched and beat up for $55 a month and——"

As the final grievance impressed itself upon him he almost sobbed.

"And we get run out of the punishment cells," he said brokenly. "We been sleeping in those cells right along. Nice and roomy they was. And now them suffs have got them and we have to sleep where we can."

He felt a protuberance over his eye.

"If them women get the ballot," he concluded, "I ain't never going near an election booth again. It won't be safe."

* * * * * * *

It is merely a waste of breath for suffragists to try to "explain" the defeat they suffered in Maine and Ohio. There was just one simple reason for it—neither Maine nor Ohio women want suffrage, and the men of those states honor the women sufficiently to vote according to the preference of the great majority of women in their respective states. Ohio and Maine are both strongly opposed to woman suffrage and they do not propose to have it thrust upon them against their will, through the chattering and clamoring of a parcel of women from other states.

Washington is today taking care of a tremendous influx of women seeking industrial positions. No one need wait for suffrage in order to secure work. Women are being given places made vacant by the calling of men to the colors. Many of these women are patriots in the truest sense. They have given their husbands, sons, and sweethearts to their country, and are making heroic sacrifices in a woman's way. Not by clamoring for the vote; not by heckling or threats; but by loyal, sincere and untiring devotion to their country, in performing duties heretofore assigned to them. These women do not make—as do their militant sisters—a vote the price of their patriotism. They are working for the honor of their country without thought of personal gain or reward. The war has brought out the fact that women can make themselves useful in many ways heretofore regarded as "out of their province" without waiting for suffrage to give them such opportunity. Thousands of brave, steadfast, loyal women have entered on these new duties and are performing them well. Here in Washington we have women clerks in army and navy, women running elevators, women chauffeurs and women gardeners. Without the vote they have found it easy to secure positions for which they are fitted and they are getting equal pay with men who fill similar positions. The example of these women should put to shame the boisterous, selfish women whose idea of the dignity of labor duties of patriotism are distorted by their obsession to obtain the vote. Women have entered a new world since the war. They are now working side by side in the lighter duties of "man's work" such as their strength and adaptability will permit. They have proved that suffrage is not essential to woman's advancement into wider fields of labor. Men have readily opened the door of business opportunity to her. Men have not only paid women the same wages, and given them an equal chance with men, but have lightened their burdens whenever possible. And all this without suffrage.

Women have been engaged in the statistical information regarding the draft; and the women's clubs, the women's branches of National Defence and women's war work and other patriotic organizations have been largely instrumental in furnishing such assistance to the government.

Mrs. James W. Wadsworth, Jr., President of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, chairman of the Young Women's Christian Association, is untiring in her zeal to accomplish a number of important pieces of war work through that association. Mrs. Wadsworth headed the committee to raise $20,000 in the city of Washington to provide adequate facilities for housing girls and women who are doing work in munition and other factories heretofore performed by men. Mrs. Wadsworth also saw the pressing need of "hostess houses" at the training camps, where the mothers, wives and sweethearts of officers and men could be properly cared for when visiting the camp, and has pushed the campaign for funds to a successful end.

* * *

"Women are in the war because the war cannot be conducted without them," said Secretary of the Navy Daniels when addressing the Red Cross. The Secretary referred to the splendid work women are doing in knitting for soldiers and sailors, but urged that the work should be done under co-ordination. "We must not lose the spontaneity of spirit, enthusiasm and zeal of the individual, but they must be harnessed to organization." Sweaters, mufflers and other knitted garments except socks, are not a part of a soldier's or sailor's equipment, but both army and navy encourage them as gifts, if the men desire to use them. Millions of women are knitting or making some sort of extra comforts for the soldiers and sailors. Recently one million pounds of wool for garments for American soldiers and sailors was purchased by the Red Cross. It will make two million pair of socks or one million three hundred thousand sweaters. And in addition to this tremendous amount purchased by the Red Cross, other patriotic organizations are likewise making huge purchases for army and navy needs. Women opposed to suffrage are knitting, making comfort bags, and doing an immense amount of work along the lines marked out by Secretary Daniels, with Mrs. Wadsworth, President of the National Association, an alert and tireless leader in war work relief.

* * *

Dudley Field Malone, speaking at the recent suffrage convention here, attributed no small part of the New York suffrage victory to the efforts of White House pickets. Accurate figures show that the suffrage victory was caused by the vote of the "socialists, pacifists and pro-Germans," according to tabulated statements given out by high authority. If New York gained suffrage through the combination of pickets, socialists, pro-Germans and pacifists, that alone should be sufficient warning to loyal citizens of the danger into which they would plunge this country should national suffrage be forced upon the forty-eight States of the Union.

"A GREAT MOVEMENT MUST BE JUDGED BY ITS LEADERS"—*The New York Times*

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

President National American Woman Suffrage Association,
Says:

"What is Feminism? A world-wide revolt against all artificial barriers which laws and customs interpose between women and human freedom."

—Signed Article, Woman's Journal, Official Suffrage Organ.

DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

Honorary President National American Woman Suffrage Association

Says:

I believe in woman suffrage whether all women vote or no women vote; whether all women vote right or all women vote wrong; whether women will love their husbands after they vote or forsake them; whether women will neglect their children or never have any children."

—Signed Article, Special Suffrage Edition, New York Evening Post.

MRS. NORMAN deR. WHITEHOUSE

President New York State Woman Suffrage Party,
Says:

"Many of us have left our children at home in the care of their fathers, and now we don't have to hide that."

—Speech at Suffrage Banquet in Her Honor, November 21, 1917.

(This statement, says the New York *World*, "was greeted with applause and laughter.")

CHARLOTTE PERKINS STETSON GILMAN

"Unquestionably the first feminist writer in America," and a speaker on suffrage platforms for twenty years,
Says:

"The woman should have as much to do in the home as the man—no more. * * * Who, then, will take care of the sick baby? The nurse, of course. * * * If the child is not seriously ill the nurse is as good as the mother; if the child is seriously ill the nurse is better."

—Signed Article, Woman's Journal, Official Suffrage Organ.

BEATRICE FORBES ROBERTSON HALE

Leading Suffrage Speaker and Author of "What Women Want."
Says:

"A woman whose temperament has urged her into an irregular union may be obeying her own inner law, and may be, in all but conventional reputation, a highly moral person. Feminists are inclined to believe that marriages should be less lightly entered into than at present and more easily terminated. My own view is that divorce without detriment to the standing of either party is the solution towards which we are drawing, and I find this view shared by the great mass of feminists with whose words or writings I have come in contact."

—In "What Women Want."

"THE BONDWOMAN"

A Pamphlet Issued by the National American Woman Suffrage Association,
Says:

"It is the free woman's concern to see to it that she shall be in a position to bear children if she wants them without soliciting maintenance from any man, whoever he may be."

"THE CASE FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE"

A Bibliography of Suffrage Literature Published by the College Equal Suffrage League and Sold by the National American Woman Suffrage Association,
Says:

"Too many advocates of woman suffrage insist that when woman is enfranchised she will be no less 'womanly' than before, whereas, in point of fact, perhaps the chief thing to be said for the suffrage is precisely that it will make woman less womanly, in the commonly accepted sense of the term. * * * One cannot argue logically on woman suffrage without facing this fact."—Page 64.

MAX EASTMAN

Revolutionary Socialist, Editor of the suppressed *"Masses"* and the *originator* and first secretary of the *New York Men's League for Woman Suffrage*, says on the importance of woman suffrage to *socialism:*

"We have the opinions of hundreds in the States and nations where women vote to support our reasonable expectation that their influence will favor rather than retard this achievement." (Socialism)—*"Is Woman Suffrage Important?"*

"WHAT TO READ ON WOMAN SUFFRAGE"

A standing *advertisement* in *The Masses* for over a year, by The National American Woman Suffrage Association, was headed by *Max Eastman's* pamphlets ridiculing the "home and mother sentiment."

IN APPRECIATION OF "THE MASSES"

And the work done by this revolutionary magazine for the cause of woman suffrage,

MRS. NORMAN deR. WHITEHOUSE

The Crowned Leader of the New York Suffrage Movement,
Signed the following statement in an appeal for *financial support* of *The Masses:*

"In cartoon, in verse, in editorial, in story, The Masses has stood for us all along the line as no other magazine in America has. When we fight for suffrage, for economic freedom, for professional opportunities, for scientific sex knowledge, there stands The Masses, always understanding and always helping.

"Max Eastman, Floyd Dell, Art Young and the rest are genuine, warm-hearted feminists. They like us and want us to win."

—Signed Statement, The Masses, February, 1916.

"GENUINE, WARM-HEARTED FEMINISTS" OF "MASSES" STAFF HELD FOR TRIAL

Max Eastman, editor; C. Merrill Rogers, business manager; Art Young, cartoonist, and Floyd Dell, a writer, all under indictment for conspiracy under the espionage act because of articles or pictures printed in a publication called the *Masses*, were arraigned before Judge Mayer in the Federal Court for pleading. Through Morris Hillquit, the accused entered pleas of not guilty and were held for trial. Eastman's bail was fixed at $5,000, Rogers's at $3,000, Young's at $1,000 and Dell's at $500. All furnished bonds.

Counsel for the defense announced that John Reed, a writer, under indictment on the same charge, is in Europe, and Henry Glinterkamp, a cartoonist, also under indictment, is somewhere in New Jersey. Josephine Bell, another of the *Masses* staff under indictment, pleaded not guilty.—*International Digest.*

WOMEN AND THE WAR

WHAT influence will the war have upon the condition of women? Will it retard or advance the cause of woman suffrage and feminism?

To get a fair idea of this subject we must examine fundamental principles, and must not be misled by superficial indications such as suffragists are constantly citing as political capital.

So far as women's work is concerned, this war is not essentially different from other wars. Women have helped their men in all wars. The woman of the Revolution who melted her pewter pots to make bullets was a "munition maker." Women of the North and of the South worked as hard as any women today. Many of them actually fought, and one at least led a regiment in a battle charge when her father was killed. All of this does not alter the fact that war has always revealed most strikingly the essential difference in the duties of the sexes to society.

Nations at war disregard these differences at their peril.

No one has ever stated the case better than the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence; who observed the French Revolution intimately; who noted the effect of war on women of a race which has, since his time, lost its control of a whole continent. Thomas Jefferson wrote:

"It is an honorable circumstance for man that the first moment he is at his ease, he allots the internal employments to his female partner and takes the external upon himself—and this circumstance, or its reverse, is a good indication that a people are, or are not civilized.

"Among the Indians this circumstance fails on account of the military establishment. Every Indian male is a warrior, and the civil part of the nation is reduced to women. This is a barbarous perversion of the natural distinction of duties between the sexes, which I believe common to all barbarous peoples. Civilized men do not subject their women to labor above their force and sex."

It is true that the Indian woman did all the work except that directly connected with warfare, which she also did at times. In many of the Indian nations, she had the vote, as suffragists are so fond of telling us. The Indian was as brave a fighter as ever lived. He was the originator of the modern "skirmish line"; the man who invented "taking advantage of cover"; the first to employ "camouflage" and to make his apparel harmonize with the color of the grass and the ground. His strategy was superior to the white man's; in physical strength, endurance and contempt for hardship he has never been outclassed—yet he lost a whole continent to the white man—who did not subject women to "labor above their force and sex."

The Indian was organized on a "war basis." Militarism was so dominant that permanent homes were practically unknown. The whole nation was "mobilized." The Indian woman was a camp follower; her child's cradle was strapped on her back; she worked as no civilized women have had to work, immediately back of the firing line. Is it any wonder that she could not under these circumstances, produce enough children to replace the constant loss of Indian warriors. Was it not inevitable that her race should lose in conflict with "settlers" who built permanent homes and cities in which their women and children were protected from the hardships of the camp?

The nation that wins in war, in the final analysis, is the nation that best protects its human resources. The white man has subdued the earth, not because he is a braver, better fighter, but because he has *protected motherhood* more than any other race.

The feminist program is based on the assumption of *all savage tribes* that women *need no special protection* to mother the race.

"There is no limit to human endurance," declared a feminist leader at the recent national suffrage convention. "The Russian women have forever laid to rest the anti-suffrage argument that women cannot fight as well as men," asserts another.

Calmly ignored as if it were something too "out of date" to be considered, is the fundamental fact that it takes the modern woman precisely as long to mother and nurse her child as it did Mother Eve! No amount of "feminism" or "votes for women" can alter this fundamental truth.

Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, at the convention, said:

"I should object to grouping forever women with children. Children are no more connected with women than with men."

Unhappily for the feminists, nature has decreed that children are a great deal more connected with their mothers than with their fathers and no amount of argument or futile protest and denial will change nature's decree.

Nearly every *"man-made"* law recognizes this fact. The wife's right to her husband's support; the potential mother's right to protection in industry is based on the fact that children *are* more connected with women than with men.

The would-be feminist legislators but show their total incapacity as law-makers or representatives of women when they ignore and deny this fact, although some radical feminists admit it when they complain that motherhood "takes a whole year out of a woman's life."

Nothing shows the fallacy of feminist reasoning, however, so much as the actual figures of the women who have "replaced men."

According to the last report, approximately 1,000,000 more women are employed in England, after three years of war, than in 1914, when about 4,000,000 were employed. During that period 5,500,000 men from England, according to the best authorities, have gone to the front.

Obviously, one woman cannot do the work of five men in industry.

And "no man in England today is doing *woman's* work," we are told.

Therefore, it is apparent that England is fighting efficiently without the labor formerly done by 4,000,000 men who have *not* been "replaced" by women; and without the labor formerly done by the 1,000,000 women who have taken men's places since the war!

Perhaps the work formerly done by these persons was not essential—but the fact remains that if England, in time of war, can get along without the work formerly done by 5,000,000 men and women, it can get along *after the war* without the industrial labor of its 5,000,000 women. And when the 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 men return, and are mustered out of the service; when war industries cease, and there are more men than jobs—what will happen?

Men will take the places now occupied by women in industry to a large extent—and the women will be willing to relinquish the places, and follow their natural inclinations to marry and establish homes.

The *average* woman is *not* a feminist. She sees no particular reason to work in a factory and demonstrate her "independence" after the right man offers her a home and relief from industrial labor.

This also is a fundamental fact that feminists ignore in vain.

Politically ambitious women may talk all they please about women "going out of the home." The tendencies they glorify as indications of this fact are but temporary adjustments. The white man is not going to make his women industrial slaves—and the white woman is not going to prefer the factory to the

fireside when she gets her choice. And she *will* get her choice. Modern machinery, industrial efficiency, national co-operation, civic consciousness, and the wisdom learned of the war itself will finally relieve the mothers of the race from "labor above their force and sex," and civilized man, "the first moment he is at his ease, will allot the internal employments to his female partner and take the external tasks upon himself."

A few women politicians may dominate Legislatures and Congresses. And if they do, all that anti-suffragists ever predicted will come to pass, until the normal man and woman, disgusted with the legislation "mothered" by the childless woman politician demands her recall, and recognizes that protection to the *mothers* of the race is the first measure of "justice to women."

1,421,000 ENGLISH WOMEN IN WAR WORK

THE following dispatch from London, dated December 27th, gives the latest figures available regarding the war work of women in England:

"Since the beginning of the war 1,421,000 English women have taken up men's work, increasing the number of employed women to 4,776,000, the *Labor Gazette* stated today. About 675,000 of them are working in munition factories."

WOMEN OF UTAH AGAINST AMENDMENT

THE following letter from the president of the Woman's Democratic Club of Utah is taken from the Salt Lake *Tribune* of November 26. Mrs. Quay has been rather conspicuous in picketing circles in Washington and the letter is illuminating.

Editor Tribune: From press dispatches I note that Mrs. R. B. Quay, who was jailed in Washington City for disturbing the peace, pretends to be a Democrat. She has no known connection with the Democratic organization of Utah, although she made an attempt to join the Woman's Democratic club about the time she decided to go to Washington for picket duty.

She is the wife of the former postmaster at Garfield, Utah, a lifelong Republican office holder, of which fact more may be said later if this affair develops into a controversy.

The women of Utah enjoy suffrage and are willing to aid the women of other states in securing the same privilege in the same way, always with due regard to the sovereign powers and rights of each commonwealth. But the loyal women of Utah, those who wish to uphold this government in the gravest crisis it has ever faced, are not seizing this opportunity to annoy the commander in chief of the American army and navy; they are not setting the lawless agents of I. W. W. an example in defying the police; they are not giving "comfort to the enemy" by presenting pictures of discord and disunion; they are not crowding partisan programmes in front of the great plans of preparation and defense upon which may depend the future of the republic and the lives of our boys.

The loyal women of Utah and of America, regardless of party affiliations, and heedless of agitators, spies and traitors, are doing their bit to preserve peace and order at home, to facilitate the work of preparation and conservation, to confound the intrigues of the enemy and encourage the men who are offering their lives on the altar of patriotic duty.

The loyal women of this nation are with the president, with the men of the army and navy, with the flag and the cause it represents. We hope to achieve universal suffrage by our devotion to country, our loyalty and our helpfulness in this struggle of civilization against the reactionaries of despotism.

This war can be won only by union of effort and renunciation of selfishness at home, combined with the courage and spirit of those at the front. And if this war be lost, whether through the schemes of agitators like those who have disrupted Russia, or by the force of odds on the battle line, there will be little use of women clamoring for suffrage. They may then beg for life or honor. Their portion may be that of the Belgian and Armenian women, too terrible for history to relate.

Our business, therefore, as loyal American women, is to help win this war; all other business should be laid aside if it conflicts in the least with this great purpose. As loyal Americans we have no time to waste in sympathizing with peace disturbers who harass the government, embarrass the fighting men and irreparably injure the cause of equal suffrage.

We ask for equal rights under the old flag, yet some of us send our boys to the front and neutralize their glorious work by fomenting discord and disorder at home. We stand for equality under the laws, yet some of us are willing to send I. W. W. disturbers and picketers to prison while we ask special consideration for women who pursue similar tactics of picketing and provoking riots.

People are more entitled to recognition by law who themselves recognize the law, and disturbers of the peace, whether in Washington or Salt Lake City, are amenable to local ordinances whose penalties apply to women as well as to men. Whoever is worthy of the right to vote will not uphold lawlessness or anarchy. Whoever is capable of exercising that privilege intelligently will not blame the national administration for the enforcement of local city ordinances nor expect the president to set aside the judgment of a police court.

Persons who take advantage of this trying occasion to annoy those in charge of our military preparations, whether by circulating unseemly circulars, or flaunting insulting banners, deserves the contempt and not the sympathy of patriotic women in Utah and elsewhere.

All these agitators are serving the same purpose, interfering with the serious business of this government, and pleasing the same foes of the republic. When they break the laws they should be punished whether they pose as labor crusaders or as suffragists. The one does not represent honest labor any more than the other represents the patriotic women of America.

It seems to me that we should all subscribe to this obvious truth; every one who hampers the United States government under these circumstances, who crowds other matters in front of the all important life-saving work of preparation, is giving aid and comfort to the enemy, prolonging a merciless war, and exposing lives to greater danger.

Thousands of brave boys will die for every attention or encouragement which selfish notoriety-seeking agitators receive from honest, patriotic, but misguided, citizens. We are engaged in war. The chief business of this government is to win the war. It will require every energy and ounce of strength we have. It demands the united effort of an unselfish people.

Women can do their part. Those who knit, or take men's places at home, who obey the law and the peace, who uphold and cheer the president, are doing their bit. Those who scatter seeds of discord and dissension at such a time are as reprehensible as those who put poison in our reservoirs, or glass in the food we send to the camps. Those who help are working for humanity and democracy. Those who hinder are pleasing the kaiser, prolonging the war and needlessly jeopardizing the lives of our boys.

MRS. A. NEBEKER,
President Woman's Democratic Club.

THE PICKETS *vs.* THE PRATTLERS

THE suffrage movement in America is no longer divided in sentiment; the sole question is whether Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt and her followers or Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont and her followers will ultimately prevail.

As a non-partisan anti-suffragist who has attended all the recent suffrage conventions, the writer would be willing to wager that Mrs. Belmont and her cohorts will capture the suffrage movement.

There are many reasons for this belief—the chief being the comparative attraction of crowds and enthusiasm by the "pickets" while the national suffrage convention, even with Secretary Lane, Mrs. C. C. Catt, Dr. Anna Howard Shaw and Miss Representative Rankin, could draw maximum outside audiences of only 760 persons! On the other hand, the "pickets" mass-meeting was so crowded that hundreds were turned away from the doors.

For one thing, the "pickets" are more spectacular; they appeal to the more radical and to the younger element among the suffragists. The history and traditions of the National American Woman Suffrage Association can no more last against the enthusiasm and "pep" of these young radicals than the conservative suffragists of England could keep Mrs. Pankhurst from getting control. So-called "conservative" suffragists are deserting every day to the "militants." The "militants" made their greatest gain, perhaps, when they secured the support of Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont. Laugh at Mrs. Belmont if you will—she has been the main factor in the modern suffrage movement to date; and her organization will be in business when the others are forgotten.

How Mrs. Belmont "Mothered" the Conservatives

It was Mrs. Belmont, indeed, who brought the National Suffrage Association from Warren, Ohio, only a few years ago, and gave it palatial offices in New York City. Her money it was that enabled the suffrage agitators, who had been struggling along for forty years impressing nobody, to go into an active campaign. For nearly twenty years they had not won a State, when Mrs. Belmont brought the National Suffrage Association to New York. In the last few years, Mrs. Catt and Dr. Shaw have captured the publicity end of the suffrage movement—but it remains to be said that everything "spectacular," all the beautiful parades, functions, etc., by which suffrage has been able to get into the news columns, are due to Mrs. Belmont.

Militants Made Great Parade

Nobody who witnessed the great suffrage parade of 1915—with its 26,000 marchers—as compared with the 9,859 women and 354 men who marched in the suffrage parade of 1917—can fail to grasp the fact that the "militants" who would not march in this parade—are at least as numerous as the so-called "conservatives."

Then take the "pickets" themselves. The posting of these pickets; the banner let fall from the balcony in Congress; the march around the White House last year, and the various ovations given them when released from prison, are all nothing more nor less than proofs that Mrs. Belmont has adapted her talent for the spectacular to the purposes of suffrage publicity.

The Prattlers Not Picturesque

The national suffrage convention held recently in Washington was a tame, colorless, debating society affair. Nobody did anything but talk—and threaten Congress. The "militant" meeting, on the other hand, was a spectacle such as Griffith might have posed for moving pictures. Each "picket" lately released from prison carried a big banner to the stage. Each was greeted with applause. Alice Paul, the disciple of Mrs. Pankhurst, received fully four times the applause accorded to Dr. Shaw at the "conservative" convention. Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont was greeted with cheers such as we have never seen given to Mrs. Catt. Dudley Field Malone, "the new man," was repeatedly applauded to the echo—as compared with the discourteous laughter with which the "conservatives" greeted Secretary Lane before he started to speak at their convention!

The "bolsheviki" and the "socialists" were in evidence, and pledged their support openly to the "militants."

Dudley Field Malone paid a beautiful tribute to Mrs. Belmont, as responsible for the suffrage gains, and thereafter adjusted her chair, came when she beckoned, with all the fidelity and courtesy a queen might expect from a prince consort—or a suffragist from a "new man."

"No Sacrifice," Says Malone

Mr. Malone differed from Mrs. Belmont only on one issue. She had said that he "'sacrificed" his lucrative position to help the cause of suffrage. Mr. Malone declared:

"I have made no sacrifice. I did what I wished to do more than anything else."

"Something must have happened," Mr. Malone asserted, "to change the defeat of two years ago into a suffrage victory this year. Something radical." The "something radical," he continued, was "the radical labor vote of New York" and the "pickets of the National Woman's Party."

Few people will dispute Mr. Malone's statement. The radical labor vote Mr. Malone refers to was the increased pro-German, pacifist vote given to Hillquit. The pickets at Washington, defended by the New York *Call*, and exhibited as martyrs to the socialists and pro-Germans, no doubt did their share in making them believe that a vote for woman suffrage was a vote "agin the administration," although Mr. Malone did not say so.

"The New Man"

Then Mr. Malone took his seat—entirely surrounded by released pickets; a "new man" in the midst of militant women. Right here we recalled what the New York *Call* said of Mr. Malone on September 12th:

"Malone is an ardent believer in 'equal rights for women' and the husband of a suffragist. He is a new man in his attitude toward women."

And what Beatrice Forbes Robertson Hale, in her chapter on the "New Man" in "What Women Want," says:

"At present in the whole world there are only a few new men. Their numbers are increasing yearly, but still fall far short of the new women. * * * Every male instinct of domination and sovereignty has to be bred out of the individual before he can attain the status of the new man and be a fit mate for the new woman. The new man has to unlearn those deep-rooted habits and instincts of sex. The important fact for women to realize is that this nation * * * is the nation where the new man is most rapidly developing."

Yes, the "new man"—one among over eighty militant women—seemed to fall far short in numbers to the new women. But if he is "rapidly developing" in this nation we may yet see more "new men" on suffrage platforms. Perhaps, indeed, there might be more of them now, except for the feminine modesty the average "new man" may go through as an intermediate stage between "male instincts of domination" and the publicity-seeking boldness of the "new woman."

"Bought and Paid For"

As the programs were being passed out before the meeting, a strange incident occurred. One woman looked over the pro-

gram, read the names and said: "Huh, bought and paid for!" and walked away.

So much for the militant meeting. The national suffrage convention lasted practically a week. At no time was there much of an audience. Perhaps the funniest thing that happened was the demonstration that even most women suffragists do not want to vote!

Suffragists Neglect to Vote

There were 770 women delegates entitled to come to the National Suffrage Convention and vote for measures and a dozen or more suffrage officials. Only 584 of these delegates came to the convention and only 293 of them voted! And five or ten votes were void at that.

Yet the whole convention determined to extend a vote of thanks to the elections committee for doing its "difficult work so well under trying conditions." As they say in the comic supplements, "Can you beat it?"

Here are 770 women leaders, professional agitators for the vote for all women, whether they want votes or not, who could not get the majority of their own members to the suffrage polls established by their own organization.

The Blacklist Once More

Another feature of the national suffrage convention was the revival of the "blacklist" threat. It makes the third time.

Every woman who has attended the last few suffrage conventions knows that the "blacklist" always has been an absolute failure; that not one of eighteen men "blacklisted" in 1914 was defeated; that the Nashville convention, after four days' discussion, practically repudiated the "blacklist" as a bad political move; that even the authors of the "blacklist" attempted to deny that they had really, truly, meant to defeat *anybody;* that they claimed that the newspapers called it a "blacklist"—although that is what it was called on the original statement they issued to the press, and in the first story about it in the *Woman's Journal.*

"The Questionaire"

In August, 1916, the National American Woman Suffrage Association attempted to compile another "blacklist," although it was not called that. The following questions were sent to all candidates for Congress:

1. Are you in favor of woman suffrage? 2. If elected, will you vote in Congress to submit to the States a Federal amendment to enfranchise the women of the country? etc.

It was intimated at that time that the manner in which candidates answered these questions would determine their election—so far as the National Suffrage Association could control it.

Yet not one of *these candidates,* either, does the National now claim to have defeated.

The New "Frightfulness"

Nevertheless, the National hopes that Congressmen will not remember the futility of past blacklists, but will tremble at the following resolution, passed at the recent convention:

"That if the Sixty-fifth Congress fails to submit the amendment before the Congressional elections of 1918, this association shall select and enter into such a number of Senatorial and Congressional Districts as will effect a change in both houses of Congress and insure the passage of the Federal amendment, and that a campaign against candidates opposing the Federal amendment be made in the 1918 elections."

The National Suffrage Association knows that this threat is no more possible of execution than the "blacklist" of 1914 or the "questionaire" of 1916; that it is no more possible for it to defeat men on this issue now than it was for the Woman's Party, then the Congressional Union, to "defeat the Democrats" in 1914 and President Wilson in 1916.

The National a Jump Behind

The "militants" made the attempt and failed with "blacklists." That was one of the reasons they tried "pickets." The "National" is just a jump or two behind the militants, that is all.

In 1914, the "militants" sent a whole trainload of women to "defeat the Democrats" in the suffrage States. Senator Thomas, as suffragist, said of that campaign:

"There was a sweet-voiced canary on every stump and twig, and they talked to audiences eagerly furnished by Republican politicians, but they only aroused the Democratic women so that all the Democratic candidates benefited, and that was their only effect."

In that campaign, the Democratic Party gained in every district where the Congressional Union fought its candidates.

In 1916 the Woman's Party entered another "blacklist" campaign—while the National Suffrage Association stood by as a "neutral" ready to grasp all benefits for the "cause," and to attribute all failure to the "militants."

"He Kept Us Out of Suffrage"

President Wilson was virtually "blacklisted." "He kept us out of suffrage" was blazed upon banners and carried into the campaign of every suffrage State. Yet ten of these States gave majorities for the President—whereupon the National Suffrage Association declared that "women elected Wilson" just as it would have declared that "women defeated Wilson" had *Mr. Hughes* been elected.

How long do these women politicians expect candidates for office to remain deaf, dumb and blind to the fact that these suffragists cannot "deliver" the women's vote; that they cannot defeat any man on the Federal amendment issue? That their "resolutions" cannot be translated into action that does not at once cause every fair-minded man and women voter in a congressional district to rally to the support of the man they unjustly attack and "blacklist?".

FACTS *vs.* "BLACKLISTS"

SUFFRAGE leaders have developed the habit of assuming for their own purposes that all the women voters of the United States are committed to the Federal Suffrage Amendment. They repeat this sweeping assertion with the cocksureness of the politician who knows in advance of election exactly what "the people" want and that necessarily they agree with him. In their haste some of the Suffrage leaders talk of massing the entire strength of the women voters for a Nation-wide campaign against all members of Congress who may vote against the Federal Amendment.

There are absolutely no grounds on which to base the claim of unanimity among women in the States where they have the franchise. There is no evidence to support it. Quite the contrary. The issue of the Federal amendment was clearly presented to women voters in the Presidential election last year. President Wilson had flatly proclaimed that he was against it and in favor of State Suffrage. During the campaign Judge Hughes advocated the Federal amendment. Except Oregon, every State where women had the unqualified suffrage was carried by Wilson. If facts count for anything, the 1916 returns are a far safer measure of the general sentiment among the women voters than the random declaration issued by Suffrage leaders.—N. Y. *World,* Dec. 9.

NOTES AND COMMENT

WHAT OTHER COUNTRIES?

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT, in a speech of admonition and reproof, which is to be mailed to all members of Congress, that they may know what is in store for them if they refuse to follow instructions and vote for the suffrage amendment, includes one or two remarks a trifle less clear than her warning to the recalcitrant. For example:

"If other lands have been brave enough to extend suffrage to women in wartime, our own country, the mother of democracy, surely will not hesitate."

What are the " other lands " which have granted women suffrage in wartime? Again, what sort of argument for general woman suffrage is this:

"We are told that a million or more of American men will be on European battlefields ere many months. For every man who goes there is one loyal woman, and probably more, who would vote to support to the utmost that man's cause."

This seems to be an argument for a form of restricted woman suffrage, such as the Canadian enfranchisement of the female kin of soldiers and sailors. "The disloyal men will be here to vote," Mrs. Catt continues. So will the disloyal women.—*Times*, Dec. 15, 1917.

"EARLY TRIUMPH" IN ENGLAND

IN the *Star* of December 28, 1867, is an editorial item that indicates a belief in the early triumph of woman suffrage in England that, however logical then may have appeared its imminency, has had to wait until now for an actual prospect of the admission of women to the vote in that country:

"The cause of female suffrage in England has achieved a buoyant victory. The narrow end of the wedge has entered and only needs driving in. It is the first step that costs, and this step has been taken. Libby Maxwell went to the polls at Manchester and added one to the overwhelming majority of Mr. Jacob Bright, brother of Mr. John Bright. Being a rate payer, her name was put on the register, and being on the register she could not be prevented from voting; so, attended by the presidentess of the Female Suffrage Society and a guard of honor, she went to the polls amid abundant chaff and cheers and voted for a member of Parliament. This precedent is looked upon by the English papers as one of immense importance. If one woman can vote for Jacob Bright, why not a thousand or a hundred thousand, in future elections? And as women in England are in a clear majority there may come a time when a female sovereign may have a female parliament and the male sex, as a governing power, be dispensed with.—Washington *Star*, December 30, 1867.

"The National American Woman Suffrage Association, in convention here today, announced its policy of active local opposition to the re-election in 1918 of such members of Congress as stand in the way of the passage of the Federal suffrage amendment in the present session of Congress.

$100,000 Fund Raised

"To back up their resolution and to carry on the work of the coming year, the women raised more than $100,000 in less than an hour this afternoon."—Jeanette Rankin, N. Y. *American*, Dec. 15, 1917.

"The policy of the New York City Woman Suffrage Party is to keep its organization intact in borough, Assembly district and election district lines and to remain as a body of non-partisans for the present. This means that none of the officers, leaders or captains of the party may ally themselves with the various political parties."—Mary Garrett Hay, in N. Y. *Times*, Dec. 9th.

Congresswoman Rankin's explanation of her shift against war with Germany to her recent vote for war with Austria may satisfy herself, but the real reason probably does not differ much from that moving congressmen of the pacifist and pro-German class. She has been home since the first vote.—Boston *Transcript*, Dec. 10, 1917.

Should we lose the war, the ballot both for men and women would become an empty form in this country. By turmoiling for the ballot now, while the very existence of the ballot is at stake, these women are assisting the Germans to triumph, and thus are laboring to cancel the value of the vote which they claim so highly to revere. And the women do not see this. But they tell us they are competent to vote! *A federal amendment enfranchising such women in this crisis would be worth a million soldiers to Germany.*—Morrison I. Swift in Boston *Herald*, Dec. 12, 1917.

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, national president, says: " In the event of our defeat this year, we shall, in my opinion, have to admit the evidence that it is necessary to go into the Congressional elections of 1918 for the purpose of changing a sufficient number of votes to give a two-thirds majority in the following Congress."—N. Y. *Post*, Dec. 11, 1917.

"NEW ETHICAL STANDARD"

TO the Editor of the New York Times:

Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt is quoted in this morning's *Times* as saying: "We expect a solid vote of the New York representatives and a solid vote from all of the other suffrage States."

How Mrs. Catt can say this, while knowing that some of the New York representatives will vote against the amendment, and after having personally received the report of the Utah suffrage delegation, needs explanation.

Mrs. Emily L. Richards, President of the Utah suffrage delegation at the recent suffrage convention over which Mrs. Catt presided, said:

"We came to Washington this year with an organization representing 90 per cent. of the women of Utah. Some of you can realize how crestfallen we were when we failed to make the slightest impression upon our junior Senator. We applied all the arguments we could think of. We finally emphasized the words of President Wilson in behalf of suffrage, without moving him.

"Senator Borah, of Idaho, a Republican and a suffragist, made perhaps the most brilliant speech in defense of State rights and against this amendment that has yet been put into language, on March 17, 1914.

"To say that representatives from suffrage States are 'solid' for suffrage by Federal amendment in the face of these facts is to prove indeed that the suffragists have introduced 'a new ethical standard in politics,' as stated at their convention, and that this standard does not include accuracy of statement on the part of their leaders."

Minnie Bronson,
General Secretary National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.
Washington, Dec. 22, 1917.

CROWNED HEADS

Why send a crowned head to interpret one republic to another? Or why send a crowned head to the women of another crowned head to elucidate democracy?

AUSTRALIAN TROOPS VOTE AGAINST DRAFT

Vancouver, Dec. 26.—First returns from the Australian soldier vote abroad show a substantial majority against conscription. The latest count of the total ballot indicates a majority of 180,000 against the measure.

On March 1st, 1918

The Woman Patriot

FOR HOME AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE, FEMINISM AND SOCIALISM

A National Newspaper

(Issued Weekly)

WILL SUCCEED

The Woman's Protest

ANTI-SUFFRAGE NOTES

AND

The Remonstrance

There will be Regular Departments on

WOMAN'S SERVICE IN WAR

HOME ECONOMICS

LEGAL AID AND LEGISLATION FOR WOMEN